

EXHIBIT A

Plaintiffs' Response to Defendant Zuffa, LLC's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List Documents, ECF No. 674, with Fewer Redactions

1 Eric L. Cramer (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 Michael Dell'Angelo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
3 Patrick Madden (admitted *pro hac vice*)
4 Mark R. Suter (admitted *pro hac vice*)
5 BERGER MONTAGUE PC
6 1818 Market St., Suite 3600
7 Philadelphia, PA 19103
8 Phone: (215) 875-3000/Fax: (215) 875-4604
9 ecramer@bm.net
10 mdellangelo@bm.net
11 pmadden@bm.net
12 msuter@bm.net

13 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes and*
14 *Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
15 *Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez,*
16 *Brandon Vera, and Kyle Kingsbury*

17 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

18 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

20 Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, Jon Fitch, Brandon
21 Vera, Luis Javier Vazquez, and Kyle
22 Kingsbury on behalf of themselves and all
23 others similarly situated,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 Zuffa, LLC, d/b/a Ultimate Fighting
27 Championship and UFC,

28 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-BNW

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT ZUFFA, LLC'S
OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS'
EXHIBIT LIST DOCUMENTS**

Case No.: 2:15-cv-01045 RFB-BNW

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT ZUFFA, LLC'S OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT LIST DOCUMENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARDS AND THIS COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS	1
III.	ARGUMENT	3
	A. The Court May Properly Consider The Deetz Report (Exhibits 1 & 2)	3
	B. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Use Exhibits 5-12 With Plaintiffs' Experts	5
	C. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Introduce Exhibits 13-15.....	6
	D. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Introduce Exhibit 19	7
	E. The Court May Properly Consider Hearsay Statements.....	7
	F. Statements in Learned Treatises Are Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 803(18)....	8
IV.	CONCLUSION	9

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
23 Cases

4	<i>Carson Harbor Village, Ltd. v. Unocal Corp.</i> , 270 F.3d 863 (9th Cir. 2001)	7
5	<i>Doan v. Astrue</i> , No. 04-cv-2049 DMS (RBB), 2010 WL 234935 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2010)	5
6	<i>Fannie Mae v. LaRuffa</i> , 702 Fed. Appx. 505 (9th Cir. 2017)	6, 7
7	<i>Gray v. United States</i> , No. 05-cv-1893-J-(BLM), 2007 WL 4644736 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2007)	5
8	<i>Hartmann v. Uponor, Inc.</i> , No. 08-CV-1223-F, 2013 WL 12315163 (D. Nev. Nov. 25, 2013)	<i>passim</i>
9	<i>In re Imperial Credit Indus., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 252 F. Supp. 2d 1005 (C.D. Cal. 2003)	5
10	<i>Paddack v. Dave Christensen, Inc.</i> , 745 F.2d 1254 (9th Cir. 1984)	7
11	<i>Sali v. Corona Regional Medical Center</i> , 909 F.3d 996 (9th Cir. 2018)	<i>passim</i>

12 Rules

13	Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)(2)	8
14	Fed. R. Evid. 803(18)	8, 9

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Zuffa's objections to Plaintiffs' proposed exhibits for the hearing on class certification ignore
 3 both the clear dictates of Ninth Circuit law and the Court's instructions at the February 1, 2019 hearing
 4 in this matter. They also ignore Zuffa's own counsel's accurate statements of the law at that same
 5 hearing. They are also entirely new—Zuffa made no such arguments in its brief in opposition to class
 6 certification. For the reasons set forth below, Zuffa's objections should be overruled.

7 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS AND THIS COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS**

8 In *Sali v. Corona Regional Medical Center*, 909 F.3d 996 (9th Cir. 2018), the U.S. Court of
 9 Appeals for the Ninth Circuit addressed the evidentiary standards applicable to motions for class
 10 certification. The Court squarely held that district courts were not limited to considering only
 11 admissible evidence in support of a motion for class certification:

12 Although we have not squarely addressed the nature of the “evidentiary proof” a
 13 plaintiff must submit in support of class certification, *we now hold that such proof need
 not be admissible evidence.*

14 *Sali*, 909 F.3d at 1004 (emphasis added). The Court noted that district courts “need not dispense with
 15 the standards of admissibility entirely,” but that “admissibility must not be dispositive.” *Id.* at 1006.
 16 “Instead, an inquiry into the evidence’s ultimate admissibility should go to the *weight* that evidence is
 17 given at the class certification stage.” *Id.* (emphasis added). The Court therefore held that the district
 18 court in *Sali* had abused its discretion in refusing to consider some of plaintiffs’ evidence in support of
 19 class certification solely on the basis of admissibility. *Id.*

20 Notably, every single case Zuffa cites in its Objections¹ pre-dates *Sali*. To the extent those
 21 cases excluded plaintiffs’ evidence in support of class certification on the basis of admissibility, they
 22 have been overruled by *Sali* and are no longer good law.

23 Even before *Sali*, courts in this District and elsewhere in the Ninth Circuit had held that “the
 24 Court may consider hearsay testimony in regard to class certification.” *Hartmann v. Uponor, Inc.*, No.
 25 08-CV-1223-F, 2013 WL 12315163, at *8 (D. Nev. Nov. 25, 2013) (collecting cases). Zuffa’s hearsay
 26 objections are therefore invalid under both *Sali* and *Hartmann*.

27
 28 ¹Defendant Zuffa, LLC’s Objections to Plaintiffs’ Exhibit List Documents (“Objections”), ECF No.
 664.

1 Consistent with *Sali* and *Hartmann*, this Court instructed the parties at the February 1, 2019
 2 hearing as to the types of objections to be made regarding the parties' proposed exhibits for the class
 3 certification hearing:

4 Now, let me be clear about what the nature of the objections are. This is, as you
 5 all know, a hearing that I'm setting related to the motion to certify. . . . I want you all to
 6 understand that *obviously in this context the rules of evidence are relaxed* pursuant to the
 7 Court's needs.

8 *So what I don't want are technical objections as relates to exhibits*, if there's not
 9 really an issue of authenticity, if there's not really an issue that goes to the Court to be
 10 able to rely on the document. So, for example, 403 arguments or 401 arguments, I will
 11 deal with those as the exhibit comes in.

12 *The objections that I think are appropriate are really objections, one, as to an
 13 agreement about what should and shouldn't be confidential and sealed, and the other is
 14 whether or not there's something that either side views as so completely unreliable that
 15 the Court really just should not consider it.* Now, from what I've seen of the
 16 submissions I don't know if anything even falls into that category, but that's really what
 17 I'm talking about in terms of the nature of the objections and the identification of what's
 18 going to be in those filings on June 14th.

19 Feb. 1, 2019 Hearing Tr. at 9:7-10:3, ECF No. 651 (emphasis added).

20 Zuffa's counsel, Mr. Isaacson, appeared to take the Court's instructions to heart, noting:

21 So just to clarify in terms of these exhibits, I think what you're describing is
 22 what I understood would happen. *So experts, for example, can rely on articles and other
 23 things that are hearsay. There's not a hearsay objection to that being admitted.* It
 24 would be admitted as hearsay and, you know, we might note that this is hearsay being
 25 admitted for purposes of this hearing. And then it's just taken for that purpose.

26 And the same thing when you said about authenticity or, you know, admissibility,
 27 you know, I think we can -- *we should be able to agree that, you know, even though we
 28 might have at a jury trial an objection and a foundation needs to be laid, we don't need
 29 to do that for this hearing.*

30 *Id.* at 14:8-14:20 (emphasis added).

31 Sometime between February 1 and June 14, Zuffa appears to have changed course, as it now
 32 "object[s] to a large number of exhibits on the basis that they contain hearsay." Objections at 1 n.1.²
 33 Zuffa also objects to various exhibits on the basis of admissibility, lack of foundation, etc. – exactly the
 34 types of objections the Court stated it would not entertain and that Zuffa's counsel acknowledged
 35 would not be appropriate in this context. These objections lack merit and should be overruled.

36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 10035

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 **A. The Court May Properly Consider The Deetz Report (Exhibits 1 & 2)**

3 Zuffa first objects to two exhibits on Plaintiffs' exhibit list. Exhibit 1 to Zuffa's Objections
 4 (hereafter denoted simply by "Exhibit" or "Ex.") is a redacted version of the Expert Report of Gene
 5 Deetz, CPA/ABV, ASA, CFF (Sept. 6, 2016), filed in conjunction with a summary judgment motion in
 6 another case. Ex. 1 to the Expert Report of Gene Deetz, *Golden Boy Promotions., LLC v. Haymon*, No.
 7 15-cv-3378-JFW-MRW (Nov. 9, 2016), ECF No. 237-1 (collectively with Exhibit 2, "Deetz Report").
 8 Exhibit 2 is an unredacted copy of "Exhibit 3" to the Deetz Report. *Golden Boy Promotions, LLC v.*
 9 *Haymon*, No. 2:15-cv-003378-JFW-MRW (Jan. 6, 2017), ECF No. 322-14. One of Plaintiffs' expert
 10 economists, Professor Andrew Zimbalist, used boxing and certain other sports as benchmarks for the
 11 percentage of event revenues, or wage share, Zuffa would have paid its fighters absent the challenged
 12 anticompetitive conduct. As part of his analysis of the wage share in boxing, Professor Zimbalist used
 13 the data included in Exhibit 2 to calculate the wage share of one prominent boxing promoter, namely
 14 Golden Boy, for the period 2014 through the first half of 2016. Plaintiffs previously disclosed these
 15 exhibits to Zuffa through Professor Zimbalist's expert reports. *See* Expert Report of Andrew Zimbalist,
 16 ECF No. 518-5, 522-3, 540-11 ("ZR1"), at ¶111; Expert Rebuttal Report of Andrew Zimbalist, ECF
 17 No. 518-6, 522-7 ("ZR2"), at ¶83 n.149. Because of that prior disclosure, the only basis for Zuffa's
 18 objection appears to be a repackaging of Zuffa's (and that of its economist Professor Blair)
 19 unmeritorious arguments that this data is "directly contradicted by data produced by Golden Boy in this
 20 case," and that the data is "unreliable because Dr. Zimbalist failed to independently verify" it.
 21 Objections at 2. Neither of these arguments provides a proper basis to exclude this evidence.

22 First, whether Professor Zimbalist's analysis (which relies on the Deetz data) or Professor
 23 Blair's analysis (which relies on incomplete and inaccurate data produced by Golden Boy in response
 24 to a subpoena issued in this case) is more persuasive is a merits question for the factfinder. It has no
 25 bearing on the admissibility of Professor Zimbalist's damages opinion, and certainly provides no basis
 26 for the court to exclude this data from consideration on Plaintiffs' motion for class certification.

27 Second, Zuffa is incorrect that the data attached to the Deetz Report is unreliable, or even less
 28 reliable than the data produced by Golden Boy in this case. Exs. 3-4. The Deetz Report was submitted

1 by an expert hired by Golden Boy to calculate damages in unrelated litigation between Golden Boy
 2 Promotions, LLC and another boxing promoter, Al Haymon. *Golden Boy Promotions, LLC v. Haymon*,
 3 No. 2:15-cv-3378-JFW-MRW. In his report, Mr. Deetz testified that he “analyzed all revenue and
 4 expenses associated with each event promoted by Golden Boy from Jan. 1, 2014 through June 30,
 5 2016.” Ex. 1 at ¶48.

6 Zuffa argues that Dr. Zimbalist “had no way to determine whether [the] information [in the
 7 Deetz Report] accurately reflected the underlying data.” Objections at 3. Zuffa is wrong, because Mr.
 8 Deetz attached the underlying Golden Boy data to his report. Ex. 2 at 3-12. Ex. 2 lists the payments
 9 made by Golden Boy to boxers and the revenue generated by its events. It was prepared based on
 10 “detailed QuickBooks spreadsheets representing all income and expenses recorded in QuickBooks for
 11 the twelve month periods ending December 31, 2014 and December 31, 2015 and for the six month
 12 period ending June 30, 2016.” Ex. 1 at 4. Mr. Deetz also compared those spreadsheets to Golden
 13 Boy’s consolidated financial statements “to ensure the QuickBooks spreadsheets . . . include the boxing
 14 related income and expenses for the” relevant period. *Id.* Therefore, the only way the data could have
 15 been “manipulated” for the purpose of litigation is if Golden Boy produced inaccurate data in that case.
 16 However, neither Zuffa nor its experts have “verified” the Golden Boy data produced in *this* case or
 17 provided any reason to believe that it is more accurate or complete than the data produced in Golden
 18 Boy’s own litigation. ZR2 ¶84; Blair Dep. at 324:5-6 (Dr. Blair admitting that he has “no foundation
 19 for a belief one way or the other” as to whether the data attached to the Deetz report is inaccurate or
 20 incomplete); Blair Dep. at 322:7-10 (“A . . . I essentially assume their authenticity. Q. Did you also
 21 assume their completeness? A. Yes.”). On the contrary, Golden Boy is arguably more likely to produce
 22 complete and accurate data in litigation in which it is a party than in response to a subpoena in this
 23 case. Thus, it is unsurprising that Professor Zimbalist has shown that the data Professor Blair relied on
 24 is in fact incomplete, and does not include all fighter compensation paid during the relevant period.
 25 ZR2 at ¶84. In particular, Professor Zimbalist shows that [REDACTED]
 26 [REDACTED]
 27 [REDACTED]

28 [REDACTED] *Id.* Zuffa offers no plausible explanation for this obvious discrepancy.

Finally, Zuffa argues that “third-party expert reports are disallowed because ‘an opinion which is generated solely for the purposes of litigation’ does not ‘bear indicia of reliability.’” Objections at 3 (quoting *In re Imperial Credit Indus., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1012 (C.D. Cal. 2003)). However, Dr. Zimbalist did not rely on any opinions from the Deetz Report, but only on the underlying data—which lists revenues and compensation for each Golden Boy boxer from January 2014 to June 2016. ZR2 ¶83. Expert opinions that rely on other expert reports are admissible if the reports “are of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the field in forming opinions.” *Gray v. United States*, No. 05-cv-1893-J-(BLM), 2007 WL 4644736, at *7 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2007) (distinguishing *Imperial Credit* because plaintiff’s expert was qualified to evaluate third-party expert report and denying motion to exclude). The data attached to the Deetz Report list payments to each boxer annually, allowing direct calculation of actual boxer compensation. *See* ECF No. 534-36 at 3-12. In addition, Professor Zimbalist *verified* the data by comparing it to data from another boxing promoter, Top Rank. ZR2 ¶¶85-86. Thus, unlike in *Doan v. Astrue*, No. 04-cv-2049 DMS (RBB), 2010 WL 234935, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2010), Professor Zimbalist did “independently verify” Mr. Deetz’s calculation because he “viewed th[e] source and verified the data.” *Id.* Zuffa’s objections to these exhibits should be overruled.

B. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Use Exhibits 5-12 With Plaintiffs’ Experts

Zuffa also objects to eight additional exhibits from the *Golden Boy* litigation. Exs. 5-12. These exhibits provide additional context regarding the circumstances under which the Deetz Report was filed and provide further indicia of the accuracy of the data attached to it. For example, Exhibit 8 is simply unredacted excerpts of Exhibit 1, which was disclosed in Professor Zimbalist’s report, and is therefore admissible for the same reasons described above. Similarly, Exhibit 6 is Defendant’s Motion to Exclude Gene Deetz in the *Golden Boy* litigation, to which Exhibit 2 was attached. Exhibit 6 indicates that the defendant in the *Golden Boy* litigation challenged Mr. Deetz’s calculation of damages to Golden Boy in that case, but nowhere suggests that the presentation of Golden Boy’s revenues and payments to boxers in Exhibit 2, on which Professor Zimbalist relied, is in any way inaccurate.

Although Plaintiffs believe that Exhibits 5-12 are unobjectionable because they were publicly available to Zuffa and closely related to the Deetz Report (which was disclosed in Professor Zimbalist’s expert reports), Plaintiffs agree, in order to narrow the scope of disputes the Court must resolve, not to

1 use these materials during the examination of Plaintiffs' experts at the hearing.³

2 **C. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Introduce Exhibits 13-15**

3 Zuffa objects to three presentations, two of which Zuffa produced in discovery and one of which
4 was produced by Deutsche Bank, on the basis that they are purportedly "inherently unreliable."⁴ These
5 documents consist of a presentation made to Zuffa by a bank (Banco BTG Pactual S.A.) (ZFL-
6 1241786) (Exhibit 13); a presentation by Vinci Partners about Zuffa and the Brazilian MMA market
7 (ZFL-2508355) (Exhibit 14); and a series of slides about Zuffa's domestic and international operations
8 produced from Deutsche Bank's files (DB-ZUFFA-00007249) (Exhibit 15). Deutsche Bank worked
9 extensively with Zuffa during the relevant period.

10 Zuffa objects that Exhibit 13 is an exhibit "which is unauthenticated and for which no
11 foundation has been laid," that "no foundation has been laid for [the] use" of Exhibit 14, and that "there
12 is no foundation upon which to admit [Exhibit 15] as evidence." Objections at 6-7. These objections
13 fly in the face of the Court's admonition that "what I don't want are technical objections as relates to
14 exhibits, if there's not really an issue of authenticity," Feb. 1, 2019 Hearing Tr. at 9:13-9:15, and
15 contradicts Zuffa's counsel's acknowledgment that "*even though we might have at a jury trial an
16 objection and a foundation needs to be laid, we don't need to do that for this hearing.*" *Id.* at 14:18-
17 14:20 (emphasis added).

18 Nevertheless, in order to reduce the number of issues the Court needs to resolve, Plaintiffs will
19 agree not to introduce Exhibits 13-15 at the class certification hearing.⁵

20
21
22
23 ³ Plaintiffs, however, reserve the right to use these documents on cross-examination of Zuffa's
24 witnesses in the event they challenge the reliability of the data underlying the Deetz Report.

24 ⁴ Zuffa also moved to seal one of these Exhibits, DB-ZUFFA-00007249 (Exhibit 15), on the basis that
25 it purportedly contains trade secrets. *See* Zuffa, LLC's Mot. to Seal Exs. and Protected Materials at the
26 Evidentiary Hearing on Class Cert., ECF No. 665, at 7; Combined Exhibit List with Zuffa Sealing
27 Positions, ECF No. 665-5, at 2. It is difficult to understand how a document could both contain trade
28 secrets and be "inherently unreliable."

28 ⁵ Although Plaintiffs will not introduce these documents at the class certification hearing, they were
29 properly considered by Plaintiffs' experts in forming their opinions. *See Fannie Mae v. LaRuffa*, 702
30 Fed. Appx. 505, 507 (9th Cir. 2017) ("experts may rely on other reports that would otherwise be
31 hearsay to explain the basis of their expert opinion"); *see also* Plaintiffs' *Daubert* responses, ECF Nos.
32 534 & 535.

1 **D. Plaintiffs Agree Not To Introduce Exhibit 19**

2 Zuffa's sole concern with Exhibit 19 appears to be that it contains compensation information for
 3 certain Zuffa executives. Objections at 7. The proper method for addressing confidentiality concerns
 4 regarding compensation information would have been to ask that the information be redacted or sealed,
 5 rather than excluding the entire exhibit from consideration. Nonetheless, in order to narrow the scope
 6 of disputes the Court must resolve, Plaintiffs will agree not to introduce Exhibit 19 at the class
 7 certification hearing.

8 **E. The Court May Properly Consider Hearsay Statements**

9 Faced with a hearing focusing on the evidence arrayed against it relating to class certification,
 10 Zuffa has conjured up a new and invalid challenge: some of the evidence on which Plaintiffs or their
 11 experts rely is purportedly hearsay. Indeed, Zuffa seeks to exclude scores of Plaintiffs' Exhibits
 12 because they purportedly contain hearsay statements. *See Exhibit B to Objections.* Not only is this
 13 argument new, but it also has no basis in law. The Court may properly consider hearsay statements in
 14 support of Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. *See Sali*, 909 F.3d at 1004 (proof offered in support
 15 of class certification "need not be admissible evidence"); *Hartmann*, 2013 WL 12315163, at *8 ("the
 16 Court may consider hearsay testimony in regard to class certification"). Indeed, Zuffa's counsel
 17 conceded as much at the February 1, 2019 hearing: "So experts, for example, can rely on articles and
 18 other things that are hearsay. There's not a hearsay objection to that being admitted." Feb. 1, 2019
 19 Hearing Tr. at 14:10-14:12.⁶

20 Conversely, Zuffa now "objects to the admission of any of the identified exhibits to the extent
 21 they are admitted for the truth of the matter asserted in the hearsay statements therein." Objections at
 22 8. This is plainly inconsistent with *Sali* and *Hartmann*.⁷

23
 24

⁶ In addition to Zuffa's concession, Ninth Circuit law is clear that "experts are entitled to rely on
 25 hearsay in forming their opinions." *Carson Harbor Village, Ltd. v. Unocal Corp.*, 270 F.3d 863, 873
 26 (9th Cir. 2001); *see also Fannie Mae*, 702 Fed. Appx. at 507 ("experts may rely on other reports that
 27 would otherwise be hearsay to explain the basis of their expert opinion").

28 ⁷ The lone case cited by Zuffa on this issue, *Paddock v. Dave Christensen, Inc.*, 745 F.2d 1254 (9th Cir.
 29 1984), is not to the contrary. First, and crucially, *Paddock* is not a class action, and therefore does not
 30 address whether the Court may consider hearsay statements in support of a motion for class
 31 certification (it may). Second, *Paddock* pre-dates *Sali* by 34 years, so if it did hold that Courts may not
 32 consider hearsay in support of a motion for class certification (and it does not), it would have been
 33 overruled by *Sali*.

Only out-of-court statements that “a party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted in the statement” can be hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)(2) (definition of hearsay). Because the Court may consider hearsay in support of a motion for class certification, *See Sali*, 909 F.3d at 1004; *Hartmann*, 2013 WL 12315163, at *8, the Court necessarily may consider out-of-court statements for the truth of the matter asserted therein; otherwise, by definition, the Court would not be considering hearsay. Zuffa’s hearsay objections should therefore be overruled.⁸

F. Statements in Learned Treatises Are Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 803(18)

The American Bar Association, *Telecom Antitrust Handbook* (2nd ed. 2013); John M. Connor, *Forensic Economics: An Introduction with a Special Emphasis on Price Fixing*, 4(1) J. OF COMP. LAW AND ECON., 31 (2007) (Exhibit 22); and Justin McCrary & Daniel Rubinfeld, *Measuring Benchmark Damages in Antitrust Litigation*, 3 JOURNAL OF ECONOMETRIC METHODS, 63 (2014) (Exhibit 21), are “learned treatises [or] periodicals” under Rule 803(18) of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Rule 803(18) provides that the following statements “are not excluded by the rule against hearsay, regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness”:

(18) Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals, or Pamphlets. A statement contained in a treatise, periodical, or pamphlet if:

- (A) the statement is called to the attention of an expert witness on cross-examination or relied on by the expert on direct examination; and
- (B) the publication is established as a reliable authority by the expert’s admission or testimony, by another expert’s testimony, or by judicial notice.

If admitted, the statement may be read into evidence but not received as an exhibit.

Fed. R. Evid. 803(18). Plaintiffs should be permitted to use the ABA handbook and the two journal articles listed above at the class certification hearing in a manner consistent with Rule 803(18).

Zuffa contends that these publications were not timely disclosed. Objections at 8. That objection lacks merit. There is no requirement in the Rules that learned treatises be produced or identified in discovery, and the publications were timely identified as potential hearing exhibits on the date specified by the Court for the exchange of exhibit lists.

⁸ The stipulation Zuffa proposed is likewise inconsistent with controlling law, which is why Plaintiffs rejected it.

1 Zuffa further objects that “Plaintiffs lack all foundation to introduce these documents, as any
2 explanation will require expert testimony.” Objections at 9. This objection also lacks merit. Rule
3 803(18) provides that statements in learned treatises or periodicals are properly introduced when
4 “called to the attention of an expert witness on cross-examination or relied on by the expert on direct
5 examination.” Fed. R. Evid. 803(18). That is precisely how Plaintiffs intend to use these texts at the
6 class certification hearing. So long as Plaintiffs comply with Rule 803(18), the introduction of these
7 texts at the class certification hearing is proper.

8 **IV. CONCLUSION**

9 In order to narrow the scope of the disputes requiring resolution by the Court, Plaintiffs will
10 agree not to introduce Exhibits 13-15 and 19 at the class certification hearing, and will agree not to use
11 Exhibits 5-12 with Plaintiffs’ experts at the class certification hearing. For the reasons set forth above,
12 the remainder of Zuffa’s Objections to Plaintiffs’ Exhibits should be overruled.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: June 28, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

2 By: /s/ Eric L. Cramer
3 Eric L. Cramer

4 Eric L. Cramer (*Pro Hac Vice*)
5 Michael Dell'Angelo (*Pro Hac Vice*)
6 Patrick F. Madden (*Pro Hac Vice*)
7 Mark R. Suter (*Pro Hac Vice*)
8 BERGER MONTAGUE PC
9 1818 Market Street, Suite 3600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 875-3000/Fax: (215) 875-4604
ecramer@bm.net
mdellangelo@bm.net
pmadden@bm.net
msuter@bm.net

10 Joseph R. Saveri (*Pro Hac Vice*)
11 Joshua P. Davis (*Pro Hac Vice*)
12 Jiamin Chen (*Pro Hac Vice*)
13 Kevin E. Rayhill (*Pro Hac Vice*)
14 JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.
15 601 California Street, Suite 1000
16 San Francisco, California 94108
Phone: (415) 500-6800/Fax: (415) 395-9940
jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
jdavis@saverilawfirm.com
jchen@saverilawfirm.com
kayhill@saverilawfirm.com

17 Benjamin D. Brown (*Pro Hac Vice*)
18 Richard A. Koffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
19 Daniel H. Silverman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
20 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL, PLLC
21 1100 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 408-4600/Fax: (202) 408 4699
bbrown@cohenmilstein.com
rkoffman@cohenmilstein.com
dsilverman@cohenmilstein.com

22 **Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes**

1 **Liaison Counsel for the Classes**

2 Don Springmeyer (Nevada Bar No. 1021)
3 Bradley S. Schrager (Nevada Bar No. 10217)
4 WOLF, RIFKIN, SHAPIRO, SCHULMAN &
5 RABKIN, LLP
6 3556 E. Russell Road, Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89120
Phone: (702) 341-5200/Fax (702) 341-5300
dspringmeyer@wrslawyers.com
bschrager@wrslawyers.com

7 **Additional Counsel for the Classes:**

8 Robert C. Maysey (*Pro Hac Vice*)
9 Jerome K. Elwell (*Pro Hac Vice*)
10 WARNER ANGLE HALLAM JACKSON &
11 FORMANEK PLC
12 2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85016
Phone: (602) 264-7101/Fax: (602) 234-0419
rmaysey@warnerangle.com
jelwell@warnerangle.com

13 William G. Caldes (*Pro Hac Vice*)
14 SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.
15 2001 Market Street, Suite 3420
16 Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 496-0300/Fax: (215) 496-6611
bcaldes@srkattorneys.com

17 John D. Radice (*Pro Hac Vice*)
18 RADICE LAW FIRM, P.C.
34 Sunset Blvd.
19 Long Beach, NJ 08008
Phone: (646) 245-8502/Fax: (609) 358-0745
jradice@radicelawfirm.com

21 Frederick S. Schwartz (*Pro Hac Vice*)
22 LAW OFFICE OF FREDERICK S. SCHWARTZ
15303 Ventura Boulevard, #1040
23 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
Phone: (818) 986-2407/Fax: (818) 995-4124
fred@fredschwartzlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 28th day of June 2019 a true and correct copy of PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT ZUFFA, LLC'S OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT LIST DOCUMENTS was served via the District of Nevada's ECF system to all counsel of record who have enrolled in the ECF system.

By: June 28, 2019

/s/ Eric L. Cramer